



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/672,635	09/28/2000	Gary Dan Dotson	00AB148	• 8217

7590 11/19/2002

Allen-Bradley Company Inc
Attention: John J Horn
Patent Dept/704P Floor 8 T-29
1201 South Second Street
Milwaukee, WI 53204

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

HC

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/672,635

Applicant(s)

DOTSON, GARY DAN

Examiner

Kimnhung Nguyen

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Application has been examined. The original claims 1-27 are pending. The examination results are as following.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The examiner has considered the references listed in the information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on 12-26-00 (Paper No.2) (see attached form PTO-1449).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 14 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tjandrasuwita et al. (US patent 5,422,654) in view of Hicok et al. (US patent 5,59,533 cited by Applicant).

Tjandrasuwita et al. disclose in figure 4 that a video controller (c) for interfacing a frame buffer to a dual scan display (120) having a adjacent first (116) and a second display portions (114) with a display boundary therebetween, the video controller comprising a raster engine (including CRT, 102, 104, 112, 108, 110, and dual display 120) adapted to receive video data from the frame buffer to format the video data and render the formatted data to the dual display (see column 4, lines 47-63). However, Tjandrasuwita et al. do not disclose a hardware cursor adapted to selectively overlay a cursor image onto at least one of the first and second display, and first and second data paths respectively

Art Unit: 2674

associated with the first and second display portions. Hicok et al. disclose in figures 2-3 that a hardware cursor (10) monitors the Horizontal Display Enable and Vertical Display Enable lines (see column 5, lines 59-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using the hardware cursor as taught by Hicok et al. onto the first and second display as taught by Tjandrasuwit et al. because this would provide the changing of the pixel value to make the cursor appear on the video display monitor without requiring the video controller software to perform the data manipulations and transfers for the cursor.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 4, 8-13, 15-20, and 24-27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

None of the cited art teaches or suggests that a video controller for interfacing a frame buffer to a dual scan display, wherein the hardware cursor comprises a first portion of the cursor image into the first data path of the raster engine according to the comparison of the first vertical counter value with the first cursor start address and the first cursor portion height value and the comparison of the horizontal counter value with the cursor column start value and the cursor image width value, or the first portion of the cursor image comprises comparing a first vertical counter value in the raster engine with a first cursor start address and a first cursor portion height value in the hardware cursor; and

Art Unit: 2674

comparing a horizontal counter value in the raster engine with a cursor column start value and cursor image width value in the hardware cursor as now claimed.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimnhung Nguyen whose telephone number (703) 308-0425.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **RICHARD A HJERPE** can be reached on (703) 305-4709.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D. C. 20231


Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only).

Hand-delivery response should be brought to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Kimnhung Nguyen
November 6, 2002


RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600